DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 724 TM 017 768

AUTHOR Wang, Xiaoping; Knight, W. Hal
TITLE Readiness and Achievement Motivation: An Investigation of the Validity of the Readiness Scales in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (20th, Lexington, KY, November 12-15, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Need; *College Faculty; Concurrent Validity; *Construct Validity; Educational Experience; Higher Education; Job Performance; *Leadership Styles; Maturity (Individuals); Models; Occupational Tests; *Rating Scales; *Readiness; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS Achievement Orientation Scale (Ray); *Employee Readiness; Hersey Blanchard Situational Leadership Model; Manager Rating Scale; NachNaff Scale; Staff Member Rating Scale

ABSTRACT

The construct validity of two measures of employee job readiness was investigated by examining the relationships between job readiness and achievement motivation, and between readiness and the variables of education and work experience. The readiness, or maturity level, of employees is an important concept in the situational leadership model, which asserts that leader effectiveness is maximized by appropriately matching leadership style with employee readiness. Instruments used included the Manager Rating Scale (MRS) and the Staff Member Rating Scale (SMRS). Concurrent validities of the NachNaff Scale and the Achievement Orientation Scale were addressed as achievement motivation was measured. Subjects were department chairs and faculty members from 12 institutions of higher education. Useable data were received from 222 subjects (25% of the original sample). Data were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation, t-tests, and one-way analysis of variance. Findings that a follower's (employee's) educational and work experience were correlated with task-relevant job readiness confirm that leaders can rely on these variables in assessing job readiness. However, there was a lack of identified relations between readiness and achievement motivation. No evidence was found for the concurrent validity of the NachNaff and Achievement Orientation Scales. In addition, the measures do not appear to discriminate adequately among readiness levels. Six data tables and a 17-item list of references are included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340724

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
XIAOPING WANG
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

READINESS AND ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE VALIDITY OF THE READINESS SCALES IN HERSEY AND BLANCHARD'S SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Xiaoping Wang
Northeast State Technical Community College
W. Hal Knight
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

Paper Presented at the
Mid-South Educational Research Conference
Lexington, Kentucky
November 13-16, 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM017768

Readiness and Motivation: An investigation of the

Validity of the Readiness Scales in Hersey

And Blanchard's Situational Leadership

Introduction

Effective leadership is one of the most essential elements of success in organizations. The identification of the factors that contribute to leader effectiveness, however, has long been an intriguing problem. Although initial studies on leadership effectiveness concentrated on traits or characteristics of leaders (Stogdill, 1948), later studies emphasized leader behaviors (Hemphill & Coons, 1950; Halpin, 1966). The behavioral studies have identified various dimensions of leadership behavior that are centered around two basic dimensions: organization-oriented behavior and individual-oriented behavior (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). These studies showed effective leader behavior tended to be associated with high performance in both dimensions (Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Halpin, 1959).

Ever since the late 1960s, another stream of leadership studies has focused on the contingency or situation: the most effective leadership styles are associated with the situation (Fiedler, 1967). Situational Leadership, a theory developed by Hersey and Blanchard in the late 1960s and early 1970s, has become one of the most popular leadership models in recent years. It has been used in management training in all kinds of organizational settings (Hersey, Angelini, & Carakushansky, 1982). The major premise of the model is that there is no one best leadership style for all situations; rather, leader effectiveness is maximized by appropriately matching the leadership style with the maturity level (later, it was also called readiness level) of the followers.

In Situational Leadership, two dimensions of leader behavior style are identified: task behavior and relationship behavior. Task behavior refers to the extent to which leaders are likely to spell out the duties and responsibilities of the group members (followers). Relationship behavior is associated with the extent to which leaders endeavor to maintain a two-way or multi-way communication (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 172). Four leadership styles are distinguished in Situational Leadership which are combinations of the two dimensions. Style 1 (S1) is high on task-behavior and low on relationship behavior; Style 2 (S2) is high on both behaviors; Style 3 (S3) is high on relationship behavior and low on task behavior; and Style 4 (S4) is low on both behaviors.

The situational variable in Situational Leadership is employee maturity, or employee readiness, related to a specific task. According to Hersey and Blanchard, readiness refers to "the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task" (1988, p. 174). The two dimensions composing employee readiness are willingness, or psychological readiness, and ability, or job readiness, related to a specific task.

Willingness, or psychological readiness, refers to the followers' willingness to take responsibility for directing their own behavior in completing a specific task. "It is the extent to which an individual has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 175). Hersey and Blanchard argue (1988, p. 184) that willingness is affected by achievement motivation as it is defined by McClelland (1961). According to McClelland, people with strong or high need for achievement would seek out situations in which they could get achievement satisfaction. They set challenging but attainable achievement standards for themselves and do not rely on extrinsic incentives.

They also try harder and more successfully to reach the standards they set for themselves (McClelland, 1961). This need for achievement (n Ach), according to Hersey and Blanchard, influences the willingness dimension of employee readiness (1988). Accordingly, it can be assumed that a person who has a low level of achievement motivation would be expected to have a low level of willingness; a person with a high level of achievement motivation, on the other hand, would be expected to have a high level of willingness.

Ability, or job readiness, is related to the ability and competence to perform certain tasks in a particular area (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). Ability is determined by knowledge and skills, which are affected and determined by education and/or working experience (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Different combinations of the two dimensions of willingness and ability constitute the continuum of follower readiness in Situational Leadership. The continuum contains the following four levels of readiness:

R1. Low ability and low willingness

R2. Low ability and high willingness

R3. High ability and low willingness

R4. High ability and high willingness

According to Situational Leadership, leader effectiveness is generated when the leader correctly assesses the follower's readiness level and applies the leadership style appropriate for that readiness level. Leader effectiveness will be maximized when S1 matches with R1, S2 with R2, S3 with R3, and S4 with R4.

The concept of employee readiness is crucial in Situational Leadership because it is

the only situational component in the theory that dictates which leadership style should be used in a given situation for maximizing leader effectiveness. It is essential that leaders accurately assess the follower's readiness level so an appropriate leadership style is applied in a particular situation. For the purpose of helping both leaders and their followers make valid judgments about follower readiness and facilitating research using Situational Leadership, two instruments were developed to measure the construct of employee readiness: Manager Rating Scale, and Staff Member Rating Scale (Hambleton, Blanchard, & Hersey, 1977). Each of these Likert-type instruments consists of two 10-item subscales measuring psychological and job readiness, respectively, on an eight-point scale. The instruments have been reported to have high reliabilities: test-retest reliabilities of .84 on the ability scale and .88 on the willingness scale (Hersey, Blanchard, & Hambleton, 1978).

Although the two instruments have been popularly used in Situational Leadership research and other leadership studies, questions have been raised concerning the validity of the instruments, especially when the instruments were used in educational settings (Beck, 1978; Clark, 1981; Clothier, 1984). Even though previous research has shown a clear need for testing and revising the Situational Leadership instruments (Beck, 1978; Clothier, 1984), few studies have rigorously examined the validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness.

In the present study, the construct validity of the two instruments measuring readiness in Situational Leadership was investigated by examining the relationships between readiness and achievement motivation, and between readiness and the variables of education and work experience. The concurrent validity of the NachNaff scale (NachNaff) (Lindgren, 1976) and

the Achievement Orientation scale (AO) (Ray, 1975), used to measure achievement motivation, was also addressed.

Analysis of the data collected in the study was conducted to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between task-relevant employee psychological readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and achievement motivation defined by McClelland?
2. Is there a relationship between employee task-relevant job readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and educational and work experience related to the specific research, service, and instructional tasks?
3. Is there a relationship between employees' self-perceptions of their level of task-relevant readiness and their employer's perception of it?
4. What is the concurrent validity of the two instruments used in the study measuring achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

Methodology

Subjects and Procedure

The subjects of this study consisted of 222 department chairs and 666 faculty randomly selected from 12 higher educational institutions in the 12 Southern states that are classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Five instruments were used to gather data needed for the study: the Readiness Scales-

-Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale used to measure faculty readiness levels, the NachNaff Scale and the Achievement Orientation Scale used to measure faculty's achievement motivation, and a questionnaire used to solicit faculty demographic characteristics.

In this study, the Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale and the Staff Rating Form were completed by the department chairs and the faculty on faculty's readiness. Faculty readiness assessed was related to the specific tasks of teaching a particular course related to the faculty member's educational background, completion of a research project, and serving on a departmental committee.

A job readiness score and a psychological score for each specific task from each form were obtained by summing the total of the five job readiness ratings and the willingness ratings, respectively. After these scores were calculated, they were added to determine the faculty's overall readiness score.

The NachNaff scale used to measure faculty achievement motivation was an adjective checklist which consisted of 30 pairs of forced-choice items. The subjects were required to choose between self-descriptions characterized by achievement motivation and those characterized by affiliation. The scale was scored in the direction of the need for achievement and the possible highest score for the need for achievement motivation was 30.

The Achievement Orientation (AO) Scale was a questionnaire composed of 28 items that measured n Ach. The subjects were asked to respond to each of the 28 questions with either a "Yes" with a value of 3, or "No" with a value 1, or "?" with a value of 2. The highest possible score of n Ach was 84 and the lowest was 28.

In this study, the department chairs were asked to complete the Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale for each faculty selected from the department. Each faculty member was requested to finish a demographic questionnaire, the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale, the NachNaff Scale, and the AO Scale.

Each department chair was contacted and sent a package containing all the instruments for both the department chair and faculty to complete. The department chair was requested to choose a random stratified sample of three faculty members (each at the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor) from the department and distributed the appropriate instruments to the faculty members chosen for the study. Both the department chair and the faculty were requested to complete the instruments and send them back to the researcher.

Data Analysis

The parametric statistical techniques of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient tests, t-tests, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to analyze the appropriate data category. All the results were tested at a significance level of $\alpha = .05$ using one-tailed tests.

Results

Characteristics of Respondents

Usable data were returned by 222 (25%) although responses were received from 340 (38%) of the possible total of 884. Thirty-four professional ranks (3.9%) were reported by

chairs to be either vacant or unused. Twenty-one department chairs (9.5%) declined to participate for various reasons.

Chairs and faculty from departments in all 12 states were represented in the responses. Responses were also representative of both genders (62.8% of males and 36.5% of females). Faculty demographic data showed that the average years of teaching at the present positions for male full professors (M =16.02) and assistant professors (M = 7.00) were fewer than those for female full professors (19.67) and female assistant professors (M = 7.94). The opposite was true for associate professors (M = 11.12 for males, and M = 10.75 for females). In total years of teaching experience, however, the average for male faculty was higher than female faculty at all ranks. Also of note is the relatively small quantity of publications and presentations in the last three years by faculty of both genders at all ranks. For instance, the average number of books published was .29, .06, and .30 for male full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively; the average was .50, .06, and .09 for female full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively. Similarly, the average of presentations at state conferences was 1.40, .85, and .91 for male full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively. For female full, associate, and assistant professors, the average was 2.50, 2.13, and .80, respectively. Such results were not unexpected since the subjects were faculty from institutions classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I by the Carnegie Foundation. These higher educational institutions, in general, emphasize teaching over research. Such an emphasis was certainly reflected in the data collected for this study (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 About Here

Relationship Between Psychological Readiness and Achievement Motivation

The statistical analyses in this study did not generate much support for Hersey and Blanchard's claim that the employee's psychological readiness related to specific tasks was affected and mediated by the person's achievement motivation. To determine the relationship between the two variables of psychological readiness and achievement motivation, 12 Pearson r correlation tests were conducted to analyze scores on the two variables obtained both from faculty self-rating and department chairs' rating. Out of these 12 tests, only one correlation was statistically significant--the correlation between faculty self-rated psychological readiness for research and achievement motivation measured by NachNaff ($r = 0.35$, $p < .001$) (see Table 2).

Insert Table 2 About Here

Relationship Between Job Readiness and Education and Work Experience

To test the construct validity of the two readiness scales, analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between faculty job readiness and their rank and work and educational experience related to the three tasks of teaching, research, and service. Faculty

educational experience consisted of data on the highest degree that the person possessed at the time the study was conducted. Since only two subjects had a specialist degree, this group of faculty was excluded in the testing. Only those respondents holding a doctorate or a master's degree were compared. Six t-tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty job readiness, both self-rated and department chair-rated, for teaching, research, or service between faculty with a doctorate and faculty with a master's.

There was a statistically significant difference between faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree for teaching ($t = 2.59$, $df = 141$, $p < .01$) and for research ($t = 2.79$, $df = 139$, $p < .01$). In both cases of teaching and research, the mean scores for the faculty members with a doctorate (38.17 and 33.61) were higher than those for the faculty with a master's degree (37.01 and 30.14). Faculty with a doctorate rated themselves higher on job readiness for teaching and research than those with a master's degree. However, no significant difference was found in faculty self-rated job readiness for service between the two groups (see Table 3).

Insert Table 3 About Here

Furthermore, no statistically significant difference was found in faculty chair-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service between the faculty with a doctorate and the faculty with a master's degree.

Similar situations occurred for testing the correlations between faculty job readiness and their work experience. Data collected for work experience included the total number of

years of teaching for the teaching task; the total number of publications of books, chapters and articles as well as presentations at national, regional, and state conferences during the last three years for the research task; and the total number of hours of public service at the departmental, school, and university levels during the last three years for the service task. Six Pearson r correlation tests were conducted to determine the relationship between faculty job readiness, both faculty self-rated and department chair-rated, for teaching, research, and service and faculty work experience related to the task.

All the correlations between faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service and their relevant work experience were found statistically significant although no correlations were very high ($n = 146$, $r = .16$, $p < .05$ for teaching; $n = 143$, $r = .29$, $p < .001$ for research; and $n = 136$, $r = .23$, $p < .01$ for service). However, no correlations were statistically significant when the relationship was tested between faculty chair-rated job readiness for the three tasks and faculty relevant work experience.

Six ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty job readiness, both faculty self-rated and department chair-rated, for teaching, research, and service among three ranks of full, associate, and assistant professors. There were statistically significant differences in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching ($F [2, 143] = 5.08$, $p < .01$) and service ($F [2,139] = 4.33$, $p < .05$) among the groups of full, associate, and assistant professors while no statistically significant difference was found for research. Student Newman-Keuls tests were conducted to determine which group(s) was statistically different from the others. The results indicated that, in the case of job readiness for teaching, assistant professors ($M = 37.28$) were statistically different from

full professors (M = 38.39) and associate professors (M = 38.32). Similar results were found in the case of job readiness for service. Assistant professors (M = 33.60) were statistically different from full professors (M = 35.90) and associate professors (M = 36.00). In both cases of teaching and service, assistant professors rated themselves lower on job readiness than did full or associate professors (see Table 4).

Insert Table 4 About Here

Again, a statistically significant difference was found in the subscale of faculty chair-rated job readiness for teaching among full, associate, and assistant professors (F [2, 111] = 3.80, p <.05), whereas no significant differences were found in the other two subscales of research and service among the three faculty ranked groups. A Student Newman-Keuls test was conducted to see which group was statistically different, and the result showed that assistant professors (M = 35.5) were statistically different from full professors (M = 37.4) and associate professors (M = 37.4). This indicated that the department chairs rated assistant professors lower than they did the full and associate professors on job readiness for teaching (see Table 5).

Insert Table 5 About Here

Correlation Between Faculty Self-Rated Readiness Scores and Department Chair-Rated Readiness Scores

No statistically significant correlations were found between the scores of faculty self-rated psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service and the scores rated by the department chairs. As for faculty job readiness for the three tasks, a statistically significant correlation was found between faculty self-rated scores for their job readiness for service and the department chairs' ratings of it ($r = .21$, $p < .03$) although the correlation was not very high (see Table 6).

Insert Table 6 About Here

In the case of faculty overall readiness, once again there were no statistically significant correlations between the scores of faculty self-rated overall readiness and the scores rated by the department chairs related to the three tasks of teaching, research, and service. This finding suggested that with regard to employee readiness related to specific tasks as measured on the readiness scales, faculty tended to perceive themselves differently than did their department chairs.

Concurrent Validity of the AO Scale and the NachNaff Scale

The scores of the AO scale and those of the NachNaff scale, both of which were supposed to measure the same variable of achievement motivation, were found significantly negatively correlated with $r = -.24$, $p < .001$.

The negative correlation between the two instruments indicated an inverse relationship between the two instruments. This finding is critical since it raises serious doubt about the validity of the two instruments measuring achievement motivation.

Other Related Findings

Descriptive statistics on faculty readiness scores showed that faculty readiness scores related to teaching, research, and service were skewed towards the highest readiness level of the four. No mean scores of faculty readiness, both self-rated and department chair-rated, on job readiness or psychological readiness were lower than 31 within a possible range of 0-40. For instance, the mean scores of faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service were 37.95, 32.93, and 35.05, respectively. The mean scores of faculty self-rated psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service were 37.70, 33.53, and 31.85, respectively. For chair-rated faculty job readiness for teaching, research, and service, the means were 36.66, 33.69, and 35.19, respectively. The mean scores of chair-rated faculty psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service were 36.36, 32.69, and 33.39, respectively.

Another noteworthy result related to the instruments of the readiness scales was that the researcher encountered some unsolicited comments from the respondents that the instruments measuring the readiness variable were confusing. Some of the respondents had difficulty understanding the Readiness Scales and were unable to complete the scales in the correct way. Due to this particular problem, some of the data collected for the readiness variable were unusable.

Summary

In this study, the construct validity of the Readiness Scales--Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale--was assessed by examining the relationship between employee task relevant readiness and achievement motivation, and between readiness and the variables of education and work experience. Data were gathered from five different instruments: Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale, Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale, the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO), the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff), and a faculty demographic questionnaire. The following conclusions are drawn from the major findings:

1. There was no evidence to show that the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale--developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977) generated valid data to show that there was a relationship between the two variables of achievement motivation and psychological readiness.

Almost no statistically significant positive correlations either between psychological readiness and achievement motivation or between overall readiness and achievement motivation were found in the study. The statistically significant correlations were found only between the readiness subscale for research and achievement motivation measured by the NachNaff Scale. This does not provide sufficient evidence for affirming that the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale--generated reliable and valid data on psychological readiness, given such a relationship between the two variables is purported in Situational Leadership.

2. This study provided evidence that the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale--generated valid data on task-relevant job readiness and that employee educational and work

experience were intervening variables for task-relevant job readiness.

Situational Leadership postulates that employee job readiness related to specific tasks is determined and influenced by the person's education and work experience. In this study, such a relationship was found between faculty job readiness measured by the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale--and faculty education and work experience. Factors of faculty rank, length of teaching experience, number of publications and presentations, hours of public service, and terminal degree earned were mediating factors for faculty job readiness.

3. Little or no evidence was found for concurrent validity of the Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale completed by department chairs and the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale completed by faculty in this study. Almost all faculty self-ratings of job relevant readiness and the ratings by department chairs were found statistically uncorrelated. Faculty perceived themselves differently on psychological readiness, job readiness, and overall readiness from the way their department chairs perceived them. The lack of relationship between faculty perceptions and those of the department chairs suggests that the instruments may have poor concurrent validity.

4. The current Readiness Scales--Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating--are not discriminative enough to identify four levels of employee readiness. In this study, no mean scores of faculty job readiness or psychological readiness related to teaching, research, and service were lower than 31 within a possible range of 0-40. Such a problem of skewing readiness scores towards the highest or higher levels of readiness has been reported by several previous researchers (Beck, 1978; Vetter, 1985; Clothier, 1984). The lack of discrimination among the readiness levels suggests that the readiness scales do not accurately assess employ

readiness levels. Such a result may also help explain why many correlations between scores of psychological readiness and those of achievement motivation were not significant since the restricted range of the readiness scores would reduce the value of correlations.

5. No evidence was found for the concurrent validity for the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff) and the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO), both of which measured achievement motivation.

In summary, this study has provided data and information about the construct validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness: the Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale and the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale developed by Hambleton, Hersey, and Blanchard in 1977. The findings that a follower's educational and work experience were correlated with the follower's task-relevant job readiness have confirmed that leaders can rely on the factors of education and work experience for accurately assessing the follower's job readiness related to specific tasks. The lack of identified relations between the two concepts of psychological readiness and achievement motivation suggests that both the psychological readiness construct and the instrument that measures the construct need further investigation. Also, the study raises a serious question about whether the leader always has sufficient information to assess accurately the follower's overall readiness levels related to specific tasks. There are also reasons to question whether there are unidentified factors other than achievement motivation and education and work experience that affect the follower's job relevant readiness. Further identification of these factors can help the leader accurately judge the follower's readiness levels.

Table 1
Summary of Work Experience for Teaching, Research, and Service of Faculty Respondents by Rank and Gender

Category	Overall			Full Professor			Associate Professor			Assistant Professor		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Experience in Present Position												
Male	98	12.26	8.27	42	16.02	7.27	33	11.12	7.83	23	7.00	7.48
Female	57	9.96	7.53	6	19.67	4.03	16	10.75	7.29	35	7.94	6.81
Total Experience of Teaching												
Male	98	18.15	8.32	42	23.40	6.25	33	16.76	6.93	23	10.57	6.85
Female	57	12.51	7.64	6	23.17	4.17	16	14.13	6.61	35	9.94	6.80
Books Published												
Male	98	.21	.60	42	.29	.60	33	.06	.24	23	.30	.86
Female	57	.12	.47	6	.50	1.22	16	.06	.25	35	.09	.28
Chapters Published												
Male	98	.49	1.67	42	.57	1.31	33	.67	2.46	23	.09	.29
Female	57	.32	1.05	6	1.17	2.86	16	.18	.54	35	.22	.60
Articles Published												
Male	98	2.54	3.63	42	3.21	4.15	33	2.09	3.15	23	1.96	3.15
Female	57	1.79	2.94	6	2.00	2.28	16	3.00	4.24	35	1.20	2.13

Table 3 (Continued)
Summary of Work Experience for Teaching, Research, and Service of Faculty Respondents by Rank and Gender

Category	Overall			Full Professor			Associate Professor			Assistant Professor		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
National Presentations												
Male	98	1.57	4.46	42	2.69	6.53	33	.73	1.01	23	.74	1.66
Female	57	1.63	2.81	6	4.00	5.80	16	1.81	2.48	35	1.14	2.03
Regional Presentations												
Male	98	.77	1.68	42	1.12	2.09	33	.42	1.44	23	.65	.98
Female	57	1.33	3.20	6	1.50	2.35	16	1.00	1.21	35	1.46	3.91
State Presentations												
Male	98	1.10	2.10	42	1.40	2.86	33	.85	1.15	23	.91	1.41
Female	57	1.35	2.01	6	2.50	1.64	16	2.13	2.83	35	.80	1.39
Hours of Public Service												
Male	92	227.59	297.10	39	313.79	392.20	31	207.00	183.47	22	103.77	159.90
Female	56	171.66	211.69	6	184.50	105.41	16	231.75	189.87	34	141.12	232.11

Table 2
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated Psychological Readiness And Achievement Motivation Measured by the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO) and the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff)

Psychological Readiness And Achievement Motivation	n	r
Psychological Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (AO)	138	-.11
Psychological Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (AO)	136	-.15
Psychological Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (AO)	136	-.07
Psychological Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)	145	.15
Psychological Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)	143	.35*
Psychological Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)	143	.01

*$p < .001$.

Table 3
t-tests for Difference in Faculty Self-Rated Job Readiness Scores by Educational Level

Job Readiness And Education	n	M	SD	df	t
Job Readiness for Teaching					
Doctorate	116	38.17	2.00	141	2.59*
Master's	27	37.07	1.88		
Job Readiness for Research					
Doctorate	113	33.61	5.58	139	2.79*
Master's	28	30.14	7.05		
Job Readiness for Service					
Doctorate	112	35.13	5.09	137	-.05
Master's	27	35.19	3.36		

*p < .01, one tailed test.

Table 4
Analysis of Variance of Faculty Self-Rated Job Readiness Scores by Rank

Job Readiness And Rank	n	M	SD	Source	MS	F
Job Readiness For Teaching						
Full	46	38.4	2.19	Betwn. Groups	19.82	5.08**
Associate	44	38.3	1.61	Within Groups	3.90	
Assistant	56	37.3	2.05			
Job Readiness For Research						
Full	45	34.2	4.87	Betwn. Groups	55.70	1.56
Associate	43	32.5	6.94	Within Groups	35.81	
Assistant	55	32.2	6.00			
Job Readiness For Service						
Full	45	35.9	4.80	Betwn. Groups	96.26	4.33*
Associate	42	36.0	5.41	Within Groups	22.22	
Assistant	55	33.6	5.41			

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 5
Analysis of Variance of Chair-Rated Faculty Job Readiness Scores by Rank

Job Readiness And Rank	N	M	SD	Source	MS	F
Job Readiness For Teaching						
Full	35	37.4	3.07	Betwn. Groups	48.32	3.80*
Associate	37	37.4	2.68	Within Groups	12.71	
Assistant	42	35.5	4.51			
Job Readiness For Research						
Full	35	34.5	5.48	Betwn. Groups	29.32	.88
Associate	36	33.7	5.58	Within Groups	33.81	
Assistant	41	32.8	6.28			
Job Readiness For Service						
Full	36	36.1	5.67	Betwn. Groups	25.56	.74
Associate	36	34.8	7.13	Within Groups	34.41	
Assistant	41	34.6	4.70			

*$p < .05$.

Table 6
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated and Chair-Rated Job Readiness

Self-Rated and Chair-Rated Job Readiness	n	r
Job Readiness for Teaching	108	.05
Job Readiness for Research	105	.14
Job Readiness for Service	106	.21*

*$p < .05$.

References

Beck, J. D. (1978). Leadership in education: A field test of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory.Dissertation Abstracts International, 38 (3), 890A. (University Microfilms No. 78-16231)

Clark, N. A. Jr. (1981). Educational leadership: A field test of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 (12), 4900A. (University Microfilms No. 81-10318)

Clothier, R. F. Jr.(1984). An investigation of the applicability of the Hersey and Blanchard situational leadership theory in institutions of higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 3077A.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan.

Hambleton, R. K., Blanchard, K. H., & Hersey, P. (1977). Maturity Scale-Self-rating form. San Diego, CA: Learning Resources Corporation.

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1950). Leader behavior description. Columbus, OH: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University.

Hersey, P. , Angelini, A. L., & Carakushansky, S. (1982). The impact of situational leadership and classroom structure on learning effectiveness. Group and Organizational Studies, 7 (2), 216-24.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., &Hambleton, R. K. (1978). Contracting for leadership style: A process and instrumentation for building effective work relationships. In W. Burke (Ed.), The cutting edge: Current theory and practices in organization

development (pp. 214-237). La Jolla, CA: University Associates.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (4th. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1987). Educational administration: Theory, research and practice. New York: Random House.

Lindgren, H. C. (1976). Measuring need to achieve by NachNaff Scale--a forced-choice questionnaire. Psychological Reports, 39, 907-910.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). The achieving society. Princeton, NJ: D.Van Nostrand.

Ray, J. J. (1980). The comparative validity of Likert, projective, and forced-choice indices of achievement motivation. Journal of Social Psychology, 111, 63-72.

Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.) (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Research Monograph.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71. No. 88, Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Vetter, M. K. (1985). An investigation of Situational Leadership Model in college housing administration. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47 (1), 49A. (University Microfilms No. 86-06771)